

Democratic platform, people's resolutions. A republican form of government, definition, manhood suffrage.

"A Republican Form of Government:"

DEFINITION.

MANHOOD SUFFRAGE.

Democratic Platform—People's Resolutions.

Whereas, Our forefathers declared that governments should be founded on the principle of protection to natural rights, and that when government becomes subversive of these natural rights it becomes the duty of the people to alter or modify such government, thereby making it more effective in the protection of those rights; and *whereas*, the late rebellion and civil war originated in the fell purpose of perpetuating human bondage by severing the nationality and abrogating the principles of popular government in the slave states; and *whereas*, slavery has been virtually extinguished in the conflict thus raised, it is, therefore,

Declared and resolved, That national security, national happiness and national strength, can be re-established on a firm basis in no other way than by adopting practically, and in its fullest sense, the political axiom of equal protection to natural rights, and in connection therewith, the adoption of every agency, whether of enfranchisement or otherwise, that will assist to accomplish this FIRST OBJECT OF GOVERNMENT.

It is further declared and resolved, That no people or nation can keep the peace internally that allows one class to war upon another—that all serious convulsions in society have their origin in the persistent efforts of class to obtain an undue advantage over the balance of society; and that there is no possible basis of permanent peace that is not founded on the principle of " Equality before the law. "

It is further declared and resolved, That the instinct of self-preservation and protection is the first and highest law of nature—that this law was implanted in the breast of all human beings for wise purposes; that while it is the right and duty of all races and colors alike to resist oppression, it is a double duty on the part of the stronger portion of society to prevent oppression upon the weaker and more defenceless classes.

It is further declared and resolved, That after the most solemn acknowledgment of the great political truths contained in the American Declaration of Independence, and which lie at the foundation of all good government, it has been the folly of the American people to have so far encouraged a departure from those truths as to have brought upon us the late civil war, with all its calamities; that we can now see how this war might have been avoided had our people in common kept in view and practically acted upon the great political truths handed down to us by our revolutionary fathers.

It is further declared and resolved, That while the colored race in the United States, acting upon the instinctive desire of protection against oppression, has exhibited all the qualities that have made it an acknowledged element of national strength, the advocates of human bondage have equally demonstrated their degeneracy into an element of national sedition and weakness—that this degeneracy is the direct result flowing from the repudiation of the political truths contained in the Declaration of Independence.

It is further declared and resolved, That, as freedom has become national, it has become the duty of Congress, under its exclusive power of naturalization, to declare by enactment at the earliest day the citizenship of the colored population of the Union, in connection with all the necessary provisions to give it protection through the military and judicial powers of the government; and further, that such protection should be made exclusive of the power of any state to infract such protection by partial laws.

It is further declared and resolved, That representation in the Congress of the United States should, and must be based on the actual numbers composing the voting constituency; that there can be no other basis of avoiding the contention that must arise from the altered regime of citizenship; and that, therefore, tho the qualifications for electors of President, Vice-President, and members of Congress, should be fixed by the Constitution accordingly, and no longer left to the respective states.

It is further declared and resolved, That it is utterly impossible fully to establish or maintain protective popular government except upon the political maxim, practically adopted, “ Congress never had, and never should have any power delegated to it to infract natural rights, and the respective states should have no reserved powers to subvert or impair them ”—that we hold this to be a self-evident proposition, and the only one upon which harmony can be established or a finality achieved in the organization of true democratic government.

Respectfully submitted.

“A Republican Form of Government:” Definition. MANHOOD SUFFRAGE.

Republic —“A Republic may be either a democracy or an aristocracy. In the former the supreme power is vested in the whole body of the people, or in representatives elected by the people; in the latter it is vested in a nobility, or a privileged class of comparatively a small number of persons.”— *Brand*.

Republic —“That form of government or of a state in which the supreme power is vested in the people, or in representatives elected by the people; a commonwealth; a democracy.”— *Worcester*.

Republic —“A commonwealth; a state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in representatives elected by the people.”— *Webster*.

For the first time in our history are we compelled to attach a specific definition to this political phrase. What is a “republican form of government,” and what the political machinery by which that form of government shall be maintained, so as to make it a government of encouragement and protection to the people, are now questions of the gravest public concern.

We may assume that the clause in the Constitution which guarantees to the people of all the States “a form of republican government” is the controlling behest of the fundamental law. It is the centre of the whole framework around which all other parts revolve, and without the preservation of that centre with all its strength of vitalized and vitalizing principle, we would be certain to drift, periodically, into the same vortex of calamity through which we have so perilously struggled, during the last four years. Unless we can shut our eyes to the teachings of both history and philosophy, the causes that have heretofore produced their results, will be sure to repeat them whenever and wherever the motive and power can be combined to do the work of mercenary purpose. The clause in the Constitution which interdicts the establishment of any order of nobility, and by necessary implication, also inhibits any thing in the nature of privileged power, simplifies and renders more easy the construction to be given to this most important guaranty.

There have always been in this country two definitions of the term “Republican government.” According to Mr. Jefferson's idea, it meant a government of encouragement and protection to the masses, embracing the principle of enfranchisement, and such distribution of power as would throw upon the common people the responsibility of protecting themselves. Mr. Jefferson had analyzed, perhaps, with more severity than any of his compeers, the ever existing motives of class to subordinate the masses, thus making partiality the ruling principle in government. This great

philosopher saw clearer than most others that there had always existed, and always would exist one continued conspiracy against the natural rights of the masses; that mercenary class would ever be fruitful in its endeavors to monopolize power, and to wield such power for the disparagement of the multitude. Whilst he had many compeers who saw with him the difficulties and embarrassments with which the rights and welfare of political communities were surrounded and beset, he stood prominent and foremost in providing the remedy. Nearly his whole life was spent in devising and advocating into adoption that plan of government which he believed would be most effectual in checkmating the mercenary influences and giving common protection. Whilst he recommended and made it for the first time a declared principle that government should be founded on the golden rule, he saw no way of maintaining the principle practically, otherwise than by converting the masses into beings of power and making them the agency through which the plan of equalized justice was to be carried forward and maintained.

Scarcely less prominent has been the opposing theory and definition of "a republican form of government." In the South, particularly, the ancient Roman form of government, with its patrician order of nobility and masses of slaves, has been the admiration of the slaveholder. In the Southern mind class interest and power on the one hand, and slavery on the other, making the parallel to correspond with the Roman, completed the secession definition of "republican government." It is now a question for practical solution as to which of these two opposing definitions shall prevail in giving construction to that clause of the Constitution which guarantees "republican government" to the people of all the states.

It cannot well be questioned that the accepted American definition of the term "Republican government," means a representative democracy, and nothing else. If it does not mean this we have no starting point in defined fundamental principle. In such case the cotton states may persist in enforcing the aristocratic feature of Mr. Brand's definition, whilst the majority of the states may insist upon a 4 different interpretation. We have had many years of political conflict, and a four years' civil war growing out of the opposing principles that led to this divergence of interpretation. In this divergence South Carolina and Vermont had become the political antipodes of each other, the one bent on the policy of subverting natural rights, and the other of giving them effective protection. Each state had been left to do as it pleased without interference by Congress, and each would still have been left to have pursued its course, had not the painful necessity been forced on the nation of providing for future security, by enforcing this guaranty to the several states.

The time has come when Congress must act, not from past precedent alone, but in accordance with the lights of our whole past experience. It must now enforce a principle, fundamental and beneficent in its character, and in performing a constitutional obligation, cannot avoid taking into account the

whole causes that led to our National distress. If it was our duty to defend the Nationality by arms, it is no less the duty of Congress, under its constitutional power, to take the initiative in purging every state of the antagonism to republican government.*

* The insertion of the following resolution of The Democratic League, promulgated during the first year of the war, and which was extensively circulated and commented on in connection with the popular call for the emancipation proclamation, may not be deemed out of place. It was intended to hint at the war power of the government under the Constitution, and it may be regarded as somewhat suggestive of a similar power in government to be exercised in settling the basis of future security:

“ Resolution.

“ It is further declared and resolved, That the provision of the Constitution which guarantees to the people of every State Free Republican Government, is the absorbing provision of our fundamental law, without the maintenance of which, the fabric of democratic government must fall to the ground. It is, therefore, further declared and resolved, that any and every corroding or hostile antagonism to this guaranty of freedom should be removed without scruple by the strong hand of force; and more especially when the spirit of such antagonism is found plotting treason at home, and seeking the alliance of democracy haters in Europe, in order to overthrow, and bring democratic government into disrepute.”

It has been urged by some that the doctrine contended for had a direct tendency to consolidation. Whether this be so or not, the guaranty of the Constitution was designed as a restraining power on every state, and for the good of each and all. It no more partakes of the objectionable feature of consolidation than does any other feature of the Constitution that prohibits the exercise of certain powers by the states. It was clearly contemplated that no state should be permitted, whatever its local predilections, to run off on an anti-republican course, or be admitted into the Union under a constitution subversive of the rights of the common people. It is now believed that states have been permitted to experiment far enough in the wrong direction to elucidate the deleterious consequences, and to prove the wise foresight that provided this guaranty of free government.

SLAVERY AND DEMOCRACY INCOMPATIBLE.

No one was better aware of the fell influences of slavery, its certainty to undermine the democratic principle, than Mr. Jefferson. No one comprehended more clearly the chronic hostility of the *pro-slavery* spirit to the principles of popular justice. He combined what influence he could to attack the citadel of slavery by the direct process of emancipation. Experiment in this direction, only proved

to him and other statesmen of Virginia, the hopelessness of the project. So deeply rooted was the aversion to emancipation, that Mr. Jefferson, and those who would have acted with him, foresaw that a spirited conflict over the subject of direct abolition would probably result in civil war. In this conclusion he was undoubtedly correct. Disappointed and baffled in his attempts by the pertinacity of the pro-slavery resistance, his sensibilities were goaded into the expressive declaration, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that there is a God of Justice!"

Mr. Jefferson was a philosopher whose faith was built on the firm foundation of justice to the natural rights of man. From this faith, relying upon the inexorable laws of the moral universe contained in the second great revelation, he never swerved: "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."—"Equal and exact justice to all men;" or, whatever form of expression was made to embrace the axiom of "Equality before the law," became a text that he recognized politically, and never seemed to doubt the feasibility of its practical application. In all of Mr. Jefferson's writings he as completely photographed himself and his abiding faith in the ultimate adoption of the principles of political justice as did the poet and philosopher of later date, who expressed his faith in the almost unequalled declaration, that—

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again— The eternal years of God are hers; Whilst Error, wounded, writhes in pain, And dies amidst her worshippers."

"All men are created equal," &c. These great words had been politically spoken. It was not for the philosopher who had thus commenced the advocacy of human rights to turn back. Though baffled in the project of emancipation, he cast about for the discovery of a surer process that was to work out the overthrow of human bondage. He found this in his theory of "The Laws of Population." "Whenever the population becomes sufficiently crowded slavery must give way." Thus reasoned Mr. Jefferson. In connection with this idea, as it may well be assumed, he made himself the steady and life-long advocate of more and more extended suffrage. This was the philosopher's key with which he proposed to unlock the political prison-doors of the hitherto enthralled masses. By converting the masses into an enfranchised power, it was easy to foresee that at no distant day free labor would become the government. Through this process it was contemplated that the industrial forces of the nation would enforce and maintain the principle of common protection.

In the retrospect which we are now obliged to take in order to present the true cause of the rebellion, we must not overlook this theory of the "Laws of population upon slavery." Mr. Jefferson prophesied that under the increase of free labor, in connection with the enfranchised power of the masses, slavery must give way. Nearly all the older politicians and statesmen of the present day have held to the same faith. "Let slavery alone," said the man of peace, "and it will in due time go out and be removed from amongst us." In answer to the prophetic assertions of the anti-slavery forces,

to the effect, "that slavery would yet work the ruin of republican government and prove the bane of free institutions," it was uniformly urged that "we must let the institution alone"—"that it would ultimately die out of itself." By recurring to the speeches of Mr. Clay, made many years since in the Senate of the United States, he, of all others, would seem to have been most prominent in urging the let-alone policy, on the ground that "Slavery would go out of itself—that it would go out under the laws of population"—that "it would go out without civil war." It was this theory and belief, that slavery, from natural causes, would become extinct, that reconciled the American mind to patience. Slavery was known, and acknowledged to be nothing but a despotism in principle. It was a slur and blot on American institutions, acknowledged as such by every truthful mind, but apologized for as an accidental feature in our civilization, that, from necessity, under the influence of the moral and political forces, fast growing into antagonism, must inevitably give way.

Those who, before the war, urged the let-alone policy (and the writer is amongst the number) erroneously believed that such policy would keep the peace. It is now known that the very theory which was advanced in order to check the anti-slavery forces, afforded the very line of argument and method of reasoning that produced the attempt at revolution. This line of argument was fully expressed by Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, when advocating separation from the North as a political necessity in order to save slavery. "The condition of the slave" (said Mr. Toombs) "is not permanent amongst us. He will find his exodus under the unvarying laws of population. Under the condition of labor in England or other European countries, slavery could not exist here or anywhere else."

So deeply were the slaveholding interests of the South imbued with the theory that slavery must go out under the laws of population, that they even calculated the time at which it would become extinct. They classified population and estimated its future increase. They found more than twenty millions of free labor in the North, with seven millions of free white labor in the South. The slaveholding class, including man, woman, and child, amounted to a million and a half only. This disparity of numbers and antagonism of interest had already begun to take precedence of slavery in the territories. "According to the ratio of past increase" (said the secessionist), "the free white labor will amount in twenty-three years to fifty-four millions, at the end of which time slavery will be crowded to its centre." "In forty-six years free labor will be aggregated to one hundred and eight millions, at which time slavery will be thrown from its pedestal—it will entirely have lost its prestige." "In sixty-eight or nine years free labor will be aggregated to two hundred and sixteen millions." "At the end of this time not a vestige of slavery can remain." "In the Union, slavery is a doomed institution." "It cannot survive the shock of free labor and democracy." Thus reasoned the leading political forces that inaugurated the rebellion.

It is next to impossible to uncover the impelling motives to the rebellion without recurring to the exact line of argument resorted to by the leaders. Their puerile pretences should pass for nothing. Their pretended grievances, put forth to delude the Southern multitude and to deceive Northern sympathizers, had no foundation. Mr. Spratt, of South Carolina, in his letter to Mr. Perkins, of Louisiana, characterized the false pretences and hypocrisy when he urged that "no man in the South, deserving the character of statesman, would pretend that secession was caused by any aggression of the North, or of the Union government." Mr. Stevens of Georgia, in his speech in the secession convention, utterly repudiated the wanton charges of aggression on the rights of the South.

Any one who has listened for years to the line of argument, and carefully watched the half-concealed views of the secessionists, has had no difficulty in making the discovery that the leading secessionists adopted the same views put forth by Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Clay, and all the leading statesmen of the Union; that is, "slavery must ultimately go out under the laws of population," and "that it would be put out under the future power of the enfranchised masses of free labor." It is an error to suppose they did not reason as astutely or deeply on this point as any of their countrymen in the Middle or Northern states. It was this deeper calculation for the future, embracing the moral certainty that slavery must grapple in a little time with the vast prospective increase of free labor, growing year by year more antagonistic under its increasing repugnance to the atrocities of the pro-slavery spirit, that raised up the pretended hatred of the North, the infidelity to the Union government, and finally the desperate plan of secession. No man of intelligence, who has reasoned carefully, will doubt for a moment the accuracy of the conclusion, on the part of the secession leaders, to the effect, that "slavery in the Union was a doomed institution." To doubt it, is to doubt the reasoning of all our statesmen and political philosophers who have ever spoken or written on the subject; more than that, it is to doubt the conclusions of almost every analytic or sagacious mind.

Had slavery been an institution founded in morality and justice, or upheld by natural right, its prospective "destruction in the Union" would have afforded an apology for separation. The vast and growing interest in human bondage, absorbing from year to year Southern surpluses, had grown to be enormous. ⁶ It is however, true, that no system of oppression has yet obtained on earth, that has given the oppressor a real *conscience* in his work of oppression. All oppressors are moral cowards, and hypocrisy is the natural and unavoidable concomitant of oppression. It has never yet been discovered that men were created wholly demons. Few are so far gone in sensibility as not to fear retaliation, and the very fear of retaliation is always connected more or less with efforts to disguise the wrong inflicted. Privileged classes, who would cut the throats of the rest of mankind, were it the condition precedent to maintaining their power to oppress, always attempt to bolster up their platform of oppression on false and hypocritical pretences. It is always "for the good of the oppressed class" that mercenary selfishness seeks to justify its maintenance of exclusive prerogative.

I never arrogates to itself "the right to oppress," but merely "a vested right to govern," in such way as to place the multitude under the ban of disability from which they would allow no escape. It is this spirit that animates and controls every privileged class on the face of the globe. There are no exceptions.

THE INTENDED OVERTHROW OF DEMOCRACY.

When we come to another feature of the secession movement, the intended overthrow of democracy in the South, we begin to comprehend the full-blown atrocity of the rebel programme. It would have been something less in enormity had the attempted revolution merely contemplated the preservation of slave property. It was the contemplated change from a republican to a monarchical or aristocratic form of government that we are now to deal. When Mr. Garnett, of Virginia, in a letter to Mr. Trescott of South Carolina, assumed that "democracy in its philosophic sense was incompatible with slavery," he merely stated a self-evident proposition which the whole world understood before. His declaration merely made it more significant, as he uttered it in connection with the long-contemplated plans of secession. It was this sentiment, "slavery and democracy incompatible," that afforded the whole basis of reasoning in favor of separation. Slavery perpetuation was the mainspring, the vitalizing motive power, that impelled the rebel forces; but how could slavery perpetuation be accomplished in connection with the democratic principle? There were seven millions of free white labor in the South. It was an enfranchised power, and claimed to be actuated by attachment to a democratic form of government. Prospectively, it was a vast power in comparison with the million and a half of the slaveholding class. Its aspirations and welfare in the main must be built on free labor. Its natural motives were all analogous to those of the Northern population. Its educational, political, and social motives were the same, as also its pecuniary. It is nowise wonderful that pro-slavery antipathies were most virulent against this native-born white force of the South. Mr. Spratt, in his speech in the Vicksburgh secession convention, sitting in secret session, exactly expressed the antipathy of the rebel leaders to this native-born democracy of the South. He said:

"The form and spirit of democracy has made its way across the border. It has extended in the states of Kentucky, Missouri, and Virginia. It has entered Southern cities. It has glided into schools and pulpits. It has crept about the halls of legislation. And so it is, that we are not alone in the contest with the North, which bears the banners of democracy, but with the democracy itself within the states, the cities, and the institutions of the South."

He then goes on to argue that “this Southern democracy which grapples slavery in its homes and on its hearthstones,” was the most dangerous element to be encountered, and concludes that “its final subordination would cost the South a more bloody conflict than that of separation from the North.”

No less flagrant has been the persistent course of *De Bow's Review*, which for the last ten years has contained the consolidated views of the Southern leaders. Its reckless denunciation of the democratic principle in government is embraced in the following condensed form in which its views are enunciated:

“The real civilization of a country is in its aristocracy. The masses are moulded into soldiers and artisans by intellect, just as matter and the elements of nature are made into telegraphs and steam engines. The poor, who labor all day, are too tired at night to study books. If you make them learned, they soon forget all that is necessary in the common transactions of life. To make an aristocrat in the future, we must sacrifice a thousand paupers. Yet we would by all means make them—make them permanent, too, by laws of entail and primogeniture. The right to govern resides in a very small minority; the duty to obey is inherent in the great masses of mankind. All government begins with usurpation, and is continued by force. There is nothing to which the South entertains so great a dislike as universal suffrage. Wherever foreigners settle together in large numbers, there universal suffrage will exist.”

It may now be profitable to take into account the equally significant view of Mr. Calhoun in his earlier prophecies of the future necessity of repudiating democracy:

“That we are essentially aristocratic, I cannot deny, but we can and do yield much to democracy. *This is our sectional policy*; we are from necessity thrown upon and solemnly wedded to that party, however it may occasionally clash with our feelings, for the consummation of our interests. It is through our affiliation with that party in the Middle and Western States that we hold power, *but when we cease thus to control the nation, through a disjointed democracy, or any material obstacle in that party which shall tend to throw us out of that rule and control, we shall then resort to the dissolution of the Union.*”

Mr. Calhoun in this expression was speaking of democracy in its philosophic sense. When speaking of a “disjointed democracy,” he plainly alluded to the sincere advocates of popular rights on the one hand, and the subservient forces on the other, which could be controlled by a pro-slavery leadership. It is equally evident that when the time should come for free labor to assume its natural and inevitable ascendancy the resort to dissolution would be attempted.

Further allowing the Southern leaders to be the expositors of their own principles, we cite from a labored article in *De Bow's Review*, that is equally clear in its repudiation of the democratic principle in government. The high source of this article, emanating from a prominent statesman, and followed by leading presses of the South, explains the ulterior designs to supercede popular government as inconsistent with the new "corner stone" policy. This author, first assuming that the doctrine of "the greatest good of the greatest number is a pestilent and pernicious dogma," concludes thus—

"In America, by reason of the operation of causes wholly extraneous to considerations of government and society, the republican experiment has been favored and prolonged beyond recorded precedent; but, painful as the reflection must be to all such as subscribed to the Utopian philosophy, and have an abiding faith in the capacity of man for continuous and enlightened self-rule, it must be confessed that the experiment of the democratic Republic of America has failed."

"The institution of an hereditary senate and executive is the political form best suited to the genius, and most expressive of the ideas of the South."

That this opinion was adopted by the Southern leaders is equally evidenced in the Charleston and Richmond presses, more especially after the "Southern Confederacy" was pronounced and believed by them to be "a thing accomplished." The *Southern Literary Messenger*, published at Richmond, and noted for its harmony with the South Carolina doctrine, threw off all disguises and declared it a political necessity "to extinguish every principle of radical democracy—every feature tending to make the government of the confederacy a popular government." It openly advocated the institution of royalty in direct terms, and joined in the general assumption of the Southern leaders, that "democracy was the source of political evil in the highest degree, and could lead only to anarchy and disintegration." Not less explicit were other portions of the Southern press in the assertion that "modern popular government was the mistaken civilization of the age, which a perverse generation had lifted up in the face of ancient institutions." Jefferson Davis' idea of "the tyranny of majorities" had no reference to anything else than the vast free labor power of the Union that was certain, under the laws of the population, to become the government of the Union. This was what Davis and his compeers meant by "the tyranny of majorities." It was that future power of the masses, under the democratic form of government, that would be sure to put slavery out of the way.

It is quite immaterial to the question under consideration, whether the preservation of slave property alone is sought to be made the apology for rebellion; or, whether the ambitious design of instituting government through a privileged class, to be built upon the ruins of democracy, afforded the greater incentive on the part of the Southern leadership; nor does it avail when we

admit that slavery was a doomed institution under the laws of population, to say that “separation had become a political necessity with slaveholders.” The answer to all this is: Our whole country was properly and legitimately the domain of freedom. Our white population, with the exception of a small class, was a free-labor population. Our government was designed by its founders to be a government of encouragement and protection to the masses; and we may finally sum up by saying, that democratic institutions were the boon and birthright of our countrymen, and properly co-extensive with the natural rights of every human being embraced within the jurisdiction of the Union government. Slavery was an institution, odious in principle, and worse in practice. The highest point of respectability it could ever attain, was that of bare toleration under the best behavior of the slaveholding classes; and not even that, except in connection with the comforting idea that we must at some, not very remote time, be rid of it. Instead of allowing the laws of population to take their course, peaceably acquiescing in that which no one could help, the leaders representing the one and a half millions resolved on the desperate stake of rebelling against the gigantic power which practically represented the political rights of twenty-seven millions of free labor, and has now, as the result of the conflict, been drawn into the necessity of representing or protecting the natural rights of nearly four millions of people, who, but yesterday, were slaves.

MERCY AND JUSTICE TO GO TOGETHER.

How is this government now to treat the different classes of society of which the nation is composed? The European sympathizers in the rebellion are clamorous for mercy to the leading traitors, whom they encouraged as long as there was a hope entertained that American democracy was weak enough to allow disintegration. The rebel sympathizers in the North, whose encouragement deceived the rebels and kept up a blind infatuation over a hopeless contest, are warm advocates for extreme leniency. These forces—which are almost as much responsible as the rebels themselves for the inception and long-continued duration of the conflict—would now assume the office of peacemaker, and impudently urge a lenient course on the part of an outraged and insulted power. Again, the liberalists of Europe—our friends and the friends of humanity—are beseeching us not to stain our glorious escutcheon by straining justice into unnecessary cruelty. This is kindly advice, well intended, and comes from a quarter that has the moral right to give it. To these friends we can and ought to listen with patience. Even in our tears over the loss of the youth and the best blood of the nation, we can admit the 8 claim of mercy; but we must not forget that we are dealing with culprits of brutalized sensibilities—with conspirators who sought to overthrow a great nationality—with traitors to the South, who sought to prostrate and demolish even the half-acknowledged rights of Southern masses—and all this that slavery and aristocracy might live and freedom perish.

We are willing to admit the claim for mercy, but we have the right now to insist that justice shall be the condition precedent. We are willing to receive an atonement from those who have committed the almost unpardonable sin of rebelling against democratic government; but the condonation must be attended with a *right-about face!* Instead of looking to human bondage as a Divine institution, they must take theological refuge in the golden rule. Instead of attempting to find "the real civilization of a country in its aristocracy," they must look for it in the humanizing axiom of "equal and exact justice to all men." Instead of regarding the enfranchisement of the masses with distrust, they must be made to understand that there is no other foundation to protective popular government; and that, instead of "slavery and subordination," freedom and equal rights are now to be maintained.

Mercy is now urged for the vilest traitors that ever outraged the principles of humanity or the annals of nationality. Crimes too deep to be obliterated will go into our country's history: but let it now be remembered that the deepest crime of all would be the nation's acquiescence in any plan that should even tend to continue the past, or to build up another system of oppression founded on distinction of class. Will the nation commit the crime? When it is asked that the rebel traitors of the South, under the doctrine of state rights, shall have the power of regulating and controlling the colored people, can we afford to trust such regulation to a gang of half-subdued ruffians, who were mercenary and base enough to conspire against the natural and political rights of the masses of Southern white men? This is not now a question of state rights. It has become a national question, forced on the nation by the rebellion, and which must now be met in its whole length and breadth.

The emancipation of four millions of human beings, and their change from chattelhood to manhood, was adopted as an act of military necessity. Those who have contemplated the real causes of the rebellion, and have attentively listened to the line of argument and reasoning in which it originated, will have concluded that the necessity for emancipation was quite as much political as military. The rebels said that "slavery and democracy are incompatible." "Then," said the people, "let slavery be destroyed, that freedom and democracy may live." "That benign institution," said the *Southern Literary Messenger*, "which it is now the pride and glory of the South to ascribe to the conceptions of a Divinity, will prove, next to her devoted sons, the greatest element of power in the confederacy." This was literally true as long as the hesitating policy of the government allowed the rebels uninterruptedly to turn their slaves into an intrenching and provision-producing force. When the government saw the necessity of striking the rebellion at its vulnerable point, in order to save the nationality, it parted with its scruples about the preservation of slave property. When the government opened its eyes to the actual condition of things, it was finally brought to a shrewd way of observing that two thousand millions' worth of this "great element of power in the confederacy" had two legs each to run away on, and two hands each to fight its way from bondage to freedom. The first step in practical emancipation was taken. The colored man was recognized as a man. He

was converted into a soldier and a being of power through military discipline. He immediately rose in the estimation of the country; and well has he vindicated his claims upon the nationality, by showing that he, too, can be made an element of national power when the motives and encouragements are placed before him.

CITIZENSHIP TO BE DECLARED BY CONGRESS.

We are now to adopt a plan of making the principle of protection common and effective. If we depend alone upon the states, under the doctrine of state-rights, as construed by even well-intentioned citizens in many cases, we shall have a rough time of it. We shall encounter local hostility, chronic prejudice brutalized by unprincipled methods of thinking, and will be obliged to continue a conflict of opinion, both unpleasant and unprofitable, with slow progress and debateable results. Our Constitution will require amendment and alteration in several very important particulars, not in accordance with the infamous *dicta* in the *Dred Scott* case, but in exact conformity with that great clause of the Declaration of Independence which is now also to receive a practical national definition. We are not now to refine away and skulk around the great political truths in order to keep the peace with a mercenary class that has done its worst; but we are to define and give practical effect to every just principle that we have heretofore professed to believe in. In other words, we shall be obliged to adopt a little, and we hope a good deal of straightforward honesty in accordance with democratic principles in their true sense.

There is a way provided for all things if we will honestly try to get at it, and "where there is a will there is a way," says the homely adage. There must be both constitutional amendment and congressional action, and these must be made to harmonize. Neither must go too fast for the other. Both will be required to meet the altered condition of things under which our future improved policy is to take its shape.

Congress has a good constitutional ground to begin on. Upon that body is conferred the power of naturalization, in other words, to make citizens of all who have not heretofore been accounted such. That body has the power to naturalize in its broadest sense, and the power is exclusive of all right of interference on the part of the respective states. With that right of naturalization goes the power of protection in connection with its courts, its military, and all other incidents of power. It can be made to follow the citizen in his passage from state to state, whithersoever he may please to go. In conjunction with the process suggested, there will also follow a new definition of that clause in the Constitution heretofore rendered partially obsolete out of courtesy to the slave power, and which guarantees the "privileges and immunities of the citizens of each state to the citizens of all other states."

The enfranchisement of the colored man must necessarily and unavoidably follow his emancipation and citizenship. Upon this point the writer would be unable to improve upon the prophecy uttered by him in the Texas legislature of 1855.

EXTRACT.

“The emancipated portion of the colored race in the Union, numbers at the present time four hundred and fifty-five thousand. Reason as we will, the reflection is forced upon us, that this mass of human beings is thrown as a helpless waif on society. Introduced originally as the white man's convenience; used as such until change in the economy of industrial pursuits rendered him no longer necessary, he has been made a free man without equality, socially degraded and politically repudiated. Political philosophy has a grave question to decide. So far as the white man is concerned, it has already declared the impolicy of congregating a vast accretion of physical but unenfranchised power. Pride of birth, and wealth, and station, have gradually yielded before the principle of republican justice. The policy has been vindicated by experiment, that in proportion to enfranchisement have the seeds of political and social discontent been removed. It is now established that man becomes patriotic in the same degree that he becomes respectable; and that he is respected in proportion to the power he possesses to command respect. There is to be an ultimatum even with the colored race in America. Political philosophy will not go backwards. The grave of each succeeding generation will entomb a portion of its prejudices. Time will not impair the abiding faith that national power and happiness are best promoted by the amelioration and elevation of the masses. Whatever race is suffered to remain in the Union will be brought within the operation of the principle.”

The colored population of the states, and all the states, have become the wards of the nation. The national authority has the right as well as power to deal with this population, not only as a military element, but as a political element also. Under its powers “to promote the general welfare,” which amongst other things means “security for the future,” no scruple need be indulged as to going directly to the point of doing what is right and proper to be done. The four millions, or more, of colored people in the states, doubling once in twenty-five years, will soon swell into a population equalling the present white population of the Union. It is, and will continue to be, an acclimated industrial force. It has been bred to toil, and its habits of patient industry and industrial capacity have made it as useful and necessary in the South as the European immigration has proved in the North. At present, the colored population of the South could not be dispensed with. However feasible projects might be made to appear for sending it out of the Union, the law of subsistence, the supreme law of all countries, demands its continuance in the country. The former masters would be illy prepared to do without it. Lands without the accompanying facilities for labor are of little value;

and labor, without employment, is equally so. What is of most importance to the masses of white people South is the destruction of the basis, heretofore existing, in the distribution of wealth. Slavery created and kept up the disparity, and enabled a few to measurably monopolize the valuable lands and the force to cultivate them. The non-slaveholders under the slave system had little opportunity for hiring labor. The altered condition removes a disability on the part of the non-slaveholders and admits them at once as competitors for the colored man's labor. Whoever offers the highest and best bid for colored labor will be quite certain to get most of it, and the scarcity of that help in proportion to farming lands, and the great value of the product when labor is well directed, will be sure to make the competition for colored labor excessive. However refractory the old masters may be disposed under the new regime, should they even manifest English West India obduracy, they will soon be brought to their senses. European and Northern capital will soon displace their proprietorship in lands unless they adopt the sensible course of paying voluntary labor what it is really worth. There need be no fear on the labor question, nor any constraint on colored people to be exercised by the old masters or anybody else. The whole business will take care of itself with as much certainty as water will find its level.

On the other hand, we do not contemplate that colored people in the aggregate are always to remain servants. Throw around them the same stability in the marital relations, the same certainty in the permanent society of their offspring, the same motives to educational advancement, and we shall hear no more of the "natural indolence" of the colored race. The colored man starts much nearer on an equality with his old master than is commonly imagined. He is inured to toil, and that toil is a great capital; and the colored man will be quite sure to make use of it in the line of accumulation, when he receives the protection which the nation is bound to give, and when cruelty wholly ceases to act upon the infernal maxim that "a colored man has no rights which a white man is bound to respect."

ENFRANCHISEMENT VINDICATED.

We come to the question of enfranchisement—the horrid idea of allowing colored men to vote. This voting business has always been a 10 troublesome one to people who were not democrats. It sat like a *nightmare* on the breasts of the old federalists; good men of their times, but always making themselves miserable over the idea of allowing poor people to vote. We are now almost daily regaled by having our sensibilities drawn to contemplate the sore spots in society. We have enough, and more than enough, to make Know-Nothings of us all, were we to give way to the idea that the lowest class, so-called, is the worst class. It has so happened in the affairs of mankind that society has been obliged, in some way, to put itself on the defence against its splendid robbers—those who oftentimes control government for selfish and not for beneficent purposes. The mal-

administration of government seldom if ever springs from the influence of poverty. Men in higher life, men of means, and wealth, and influence, banding and coalescing together for mercenary purposes, commit political sins that low-down people cannot meddle with. Trace the whole history of fraudulent legislation, where the interests of the common masses have been prejudiced that political knaves might make fortunes without returning to the community an equivalent, and very little connection will be found between such knaves and poor people. Political vice in low life, where everybody sees it, looks nauseous in the extreme, but political vice in legislators, generally elected by the suffrages of honest and intelligent people, is what we have most reason to dread.

Take the more forcible example of the wealthy educated classes in the South that got up the rebellion. These men merely wanted an advantage over the balance of society, which is just what political vice in high life is always aiming at. The spirit and principle is the same everywhere, and in all countries, and it is high time that we should be taught the democratic lesson that there is one way only for protection, even in degree, for the masses; and that is, to enfranchise the people, to make them beings of power, and then do the best we can to put society on the defence against its political rogues. There has always been a difficulty in the selection of agents to work out the ways of a beneficent Providence in the affairs of us poor mortals. Lincoln the rail-splitter, in boyhood, looked less promising, perhaps, than Buchanan, and Andy Johnson, the tailor-boy, less promising than Pierce; but, under the ways of Providence, the "rail-splitter" and "tailor-boy" have proved as much better timber for Presidents, as the fishermen, in comparison with the Pharisees, were for apostles. And why? Merely because they were democrats, having no sympathy with oppression, but an honest and abiding desire for the welfare of the masses.

We must look more ways than one for the ills with which the path of humanity is beset. We must also look more ways than one for the remedy. What we would particularly recommend as a medium through which to make the discovery of the true course to pursue, is that unfailing instrument, the moral, theological, political eye-glass, gotten out about 1865 years ago, called the GOLDEN RULE. By keeping ourselves in connection with this medium of vision we need not despair with this medium of vision we need not despair of the republic. So long as we allow the aggregated multitude of our countrymen native and naturalized, to act up to the line of their natural motives, we stand upon the best possible basis of popular security. There is an unfailing instinct in man, as well as in the brute creation, to act on the principle of self preservation. This was implanted for the wisest purposes, and is the only effective quality, always at hand, to check or thwart the wicked purposes to innovate on natural rights. This quality prevails with the highest and lowest, and all intermediate classes alike, and is as strong in the one as in the other.

Society, in the aggregate, will always be in a struggle to protect itself against the machinations of its robbers. We do not mean the miserable ingrates of Newgate, or the Tombs, or the Penitentiary, for those the law, the common sovereign, can deal with; but, we have special political reference to that class who would say with Lord Derby and De Bow's Review, "The right to govern resides in a very small minority; the duty to obey is inherent in the masses of mankind." Take this in connection with the other declaration, that, "to make an aristocrat in the future we must sacrifice a thousand paupers" and we have an exact photograph of the knaves we refer to.

We trust that we shall not be called a "demagogue" when we coolly advise that the said "thousand paupers," possessing nevertheless, good *instincts*, a good *physique*, and a good show of reason on the side of self-preservation, be allowed to deal with said "aristocrat," and for that matter, to fight him, to vote against him, and if extreme need be, to compass his death and kill him, with as little compunction as the Great Abolitionist drowned the pursuing Egyptians in the Red Sea.

When we put humanity to act upon its natural motives, founded on the instinct of self-preservation, we hit upon the most reliable basis of political action. There is none other that can be trusted. Wealth is no test of political right-mindedness, for it was the wealth of the South that conspired against the nationality. Education is no test, for it was the educated class that aimed at the destruction of common right. The wealth and education of Judea and other countries murdered Christ and the apostles in order to keep in the foreground their theological prostitutes, and Pharisaic conservatism. The half-theological, half-political establishments of church and state, have had their origin with the wealthy and educated classes, and the atrocities committed by them sprung from the determination to maintain prerogatives founded on the prostration of inherent natural right. Laws of primogeniture and entail, and the whole vicious machinery of oppression, have been sprung into requisition by the wealthy educated influences in society, and it is now a debatable question whether the highest class, 11 so called, has not been the worst the world has ever known, and most committed to the purposes of injustice.

We do not intend to make offensive allusions, or to raise up a spirit of acrimony towards those in our own country who claim superior intelligence, but who have persisted in a series of political errors for which there is no excuse. Nine months ago we were in a desperate struggle for the nationality. A part of the Northern political forces were contumacious in the wrong direction. We will now put the question in all sincerity, had the colored population of the whole Union been permitted to vote for President, Vice-President, and members of Congress, which would have given the better vote, they, or the Chicago convention and its followers? We will leave this question for the calm and dispassionate judgment of our country to answer. We merely institute the comparison to enforce the philosophic conclusion that wealth and education, separately or collectively, are no certain test of

the qualification to vote. We would assume, that the safest and most uniformly reliable political force we have in the country, is that which would stand up in resistance to outrages upon its natural rights under the instinct of self-protection. It needs neither wealth nor scholarship to establish this frame of mind.

What have now become the colored man's aspirations? Simply—freedom—acknowledgment of the marital relations—right to the care and society of his offspring—full protection for person and property—the right to educate his children; and quite as important as anything else, *exemption from the insults of ruffianism*. What is the colored man willing to pay for this? Taxes alone? no; but allegiance and fidelity to the power that gives it. It is this frame of mind that will make him a safe voter. All the pro-slavery sophistries and influence will find him impervious to their cheating falsehoods. All the prejudices against his color and race will merely strengthen his attachment to the National government. The very insults heaped upon him will merely intensify his fidelity to the power that made him free. The national power, assisted by himself, was the agent of his disenfranchisement. The national ensign was the harbinger of his deliverance; and no power on earth could shake his faith or affection towards that flag, in case he is treated with the same good faith which he has already given to the government. His independence day will date the first of January, 1863. Its remembrance will go down from generation to generation with the colored man's posterity; and, if human nature is to continue human nature, history will not soon record the colored man's infidelity to the national ensign. He will venerate it as the sacred emblem of his redemption.

What other four millions of our population can we count upon with more certainty as an element of national progress and power, with proper treatment, than the four millions of colored people? We put this question to be answered, not by sophistry or prejudice, nor by that spirit of cultivated brutality which has been our nation's disgrace, but by calm and philosophic reflection that can estimate and comprehend the true nature of the colored man's relation to HIS government. Who can say that he would not be a safe voter? On this point we may defy sophistry and conjecture to the contrary. There never was yet a political proposition that stood more upon the ground of a self-evident proposition, than does the safety of the colored man to exercise the elective franchise.

But, says prejudice, "I will not be put on a level with the colored man!" Good friend, we advise you to be a little careful. We advise you to look with a little scrutiny to your own frame of mind, lest you get far, far below him. How happy the delegates of the Chicago Convention would now feel if Mr. Frederick Douglass had been employed to draw up their platform! How much better they would appear in history, and how much more elevated in self-respect, had they amended it before it was published to the world, by substituting in the place of the ridiculous document the exact views and sentiments of the colored family of the Union. You may as well part with your political phariseism

first as last. Your country and the whole world will begin to pronounce judgment, whether from the peculiar frame of your political mind you are above or below the colored man. Remember always, and never forget this simple truth, that it is the FRAME OF MIND, and its just and humanizing sensibilities, that under a republican government makes the safe voter, or morally unfits him to vote.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS—CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION.

We have a great political work to do, and we shall never be able to accomplish it without going straight to work as democrats. When we say democrats, we mean democrats; not half-breed, mongrel conservatives, but full-blood democrats. The anti-democratic forces in the Union, and their sympathizing coadjutors out of the Union, have undertaken to disrupt our nationality. The real democracy of the nation, including the colored military forces, has been too much for them. We have broken the *physique* of the rebellion, and flogged most of the conceits out of the rebels. Now comes the business of restoring the shattered fabric of our institutions. We will premise that the people have learned a lesson. They will know better hereafter than to put any but democratic timber into the structures of government. We trust they will have done with “incompatibilities,” or trying to blend materials that constitute antagonisms, and which cannot be prevented from fighting. A pure representative democracy must be our plan of government, and general suffrage the instrumentality by which it is to be carried on. We shall have contentions until we settle down upon this, and we can settle down upon it now more easily than hereafter.

12

The Constitution will require amendment in this particular. The basis of representation, since the change from chattelhood to manhood, will entitle the South to equal representation on the ratio of the whole numerical population, doing away with the three fifths basis— *i.e.*, if the South is disposed to regard as man the whole population proposed to be represented. We need have no further talk about “the Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was.” The altered condition requires that both should be amended, and *very much improved*.

Congress, when it assembles, can propose another amendment to the Constitution, declaring the qualification of voters for President, Vice-President, and members of Congress, exclusive of the rights of states to prescribe such qualifications. This will place the national government in conjunction with all the forces that can be relied on to support the nationality, and by embracing the colored people, the national party may be made as strong in the South as in the North. The stronger reason, however, for the enfranchisement of the colored man, is the absolute necessity of it if we would effectually improve and elevate him.

We need not attempt to conceal or disguise the fact, always noticeable, patent, and apparent to the eyes of every one, that representation must have much regard for its constituency; and, it matters not as to what class of human beings composes that constituency. Four millions of colored people and their increase, with power to make and unmake members of Congress, will immediately place the colored man above and beyond the reach of ruffian insult, and a little time would demonstrate that he had the power to command respect, and with that respect would come all the aspirations for improvement. We now know that we can count upon his bravery and fidelity. It is now required that such action be taken as shall add to his patriotic motives and convert him into the strongest possible element of national strength.

Why is it that colored people are taken into the churches, allowed to occupy pulpits, and permitted to become instructors on the great subject of religion? Is it because, the science of theology is less difficult than the science of government? We had supposed they were both exceedingly simple, and alike simple, when reduced to simple principles, and the more we keep both confined to the easily-understood golden rule, the better it will be for mankind. We assume that the colored man is as competent to think on the subject of government as on the subject of religion; as competent to speak, write, and instruct, upon the one as the other: that he is as fit to go to the polls as to the communion table; and, that he has just as good a right to achieve political redemption as he has to work out his salvation. The teachings of the GREAT TEACHER were simple. He chose his agents to spread the doctrines of his great revelation from the lowly. The first effective field of successful labor was the country of the despised Gentiles. The simple-mindedness of the ignorant and lowly was the soil where the words of truth first took root. What more do we need as an example to teach us that the simple mind, rightly disposed, can be made fruitful of good in all cases where we can give it effective aspiration?

NO DANGER FROM ENFRANCHISEMENT.

How often it has been prophesied in former times, that our republic would be overthrown by extending the elective franchise to poor people! And yet we have gone on from point to point, and grade to grade, in power, prosperity, and improvement, until the dynasties of the Old World had become alarmed at the rising power of democracy in the New. How happily for the cause of popular rights, that it can now be maintained that we have lost nothing in prosperity or power by extended enfranchisement. On the other hand, it has been equally demonstrated that the only great shock we have ever received, and which encouraged our enemies abroad to hope for dissolution, was the nefarious conspiracy against the exercise of power by the masses. It was the conjunctive project with secession "to destroy every feature tending to make the government of the confederacy a popular government," that raised the difficulty through which we have just passed; but, which

has also imposed upon us the task of final settlement. View the subject in any light we please; contemplate it as a philosopher, or watch it in development, we are forced to admit the truth that the strength of a democratic republic is best promoted and maintained by the "broadest platform of enfranchisement."

CONTRAST—ENGLISH AND AMERICAN LIBERTY.

Let us remember that it is, and is to be, the force of the American example, if anything, that is to disenthral mankind. It is to be this example of enfranchisement, practically consummated, that is to do the work. As long as Americans indulge in hesitating scruples over the subject of broad enfranchisement, they play into the hands of the privileged classes of Europe. As long as we say or admit that there is any class in America that ought to be kept disfranchised, they will say, "There are no people in Europe far enough advanced for popular government." Democracy must instruct by example. Laying aside our partiality for the man as a friend of our Union, it is questionable whether John Stuart Mill has done the cause of popular rights more harm than good. He has elucidated many ennobling political truths, and then given the sanction of his great name to the gravest of all political errors. He has discoursed learnedly on the subject of natural rights, and then more than neutralized the effect of his humane argument by vituperating the idea of enfranchising ignorance and vice. He is politically sentimental to a degree that makes him popular with perhaps a majority of the governing classes of the British Islands, 13 without being radical enough for reform. He has gone just far enough to add to the disaffection of the multitude without proposing to make the multitude the agency of its own disenthralment. His reasoning is like a screw without a lever, a steam-engine without a boiler, or an aquatic wheel without a current of water. His conservatism, like all other conservatism of a like nature, will merely hold the bulk of his countrymen in political bondage until national decay transpires, or such bondage is broken by bloody revolution.

When English conservatism talks about English liberty, it means unrestricted locomotion and the right to discuss and theorize. It falls very far short of American liberty, which had its foundation laid on a basis radically different from all other political theories. When the five great men stood up before the Continental Congress, boldly acknowledged the natural rights of all people, and assumed that when government became subversive of these rights, that it was the duty of the people to alter or abolish such government, they struck the first effective blow at political sophistry. Under this acknowledgment of power in the people, and exercise of power by the people, we have eschewed monarchy and aristocracy as worse than useless appendages to society. We have repudiated primogeniture, abolished entails, and severed the adulterous connection of church and state. We have promoted the distribution of property, advanced the cause of popular education, abolished imprisonment for debt, and given to poverty a homestead exempt from execution. We have gone on

experimenting under the elective franchise until we are nearly ready to consummate the destruction of human bondage by sweeping away the last remnant of political disparagement. Where is Britain to-day, with her boasted British liberty? Her masses, the great bulk of her aggregated numbers, actually groaning under the worst of all social tyrannies; political disparagement heightened by cruel and studied disparity in the distribution of wealth; and all this apologized for and maintained on the assumption that British masses, after centuries of British tutelage, are not yet qualified to vote. When will privileged class and its pusillanimous followers be done with their sophistries? It is for the very reason that the British public, if enfranchised, would facilitate and enforce just reform, that it is sought to be kept helpless through political disability. There is no other truthful reason for restriction upon it. Let us set the example of transforming even slaves into SOLDIERS, CITIZENS, BEINGS OF POWER, and thus demonstrate the fallacy and destroy the sophistry by which the bulk of humanity is still kept under disparagement, and we will have done much for ourselves, and something for popular rights generally.

POLICY AS WELL AS PRINCIPLE

Now requires the nation to draw to its support every loyal element to be found anywhere in the Union, it matters not of what race or color. The exigencies of public safety as much demand it in the final settlement of our difficulties, as did the exigencies of war during the conflict of arms. The records of the war department show that the slave states furnished THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND MEN for the Union army, and not the least part of this number was composed of loyal colored men. The unconditional white unionists of the South, who have stood by the nationality, are, and will be as helpless in holding a proper and just political ascendancy, without the assistance of the colored forces, as they would have been to defeat secession without the aid of the Union army. Just as certain as thirteen or fourteen members of Congress are taken from the North and given to the South on the basis of colored numbers, without colored suffrage, just so certain shall we have that additional number of congressmen hostile to every prudential policy that may be necessary to carry on the government with success.

Make an estimate of the patriotism of the "Vallandighams," the "Pendletons," and the "Longs," of the Chicago convention; put it with the unionism of the "American Knights" of the northwest, and the influences that got up the great riot of '63, in New York; add to this the press and capitalists in the North and in England suborned by confederate bonds; append to this list that portion of the so-called "democracy" of the North, that has no principle but that of indiscriminate opposition to party, and no argument but to cavil with what is right; make a conglomerate of all those and conjoin them with the secessionists of the South, made more bitter by defeat, and more intense haters of the nationality by disappointment, and we can estimate the nature of the political forces with which we

shall be obliged to deal in the future. These forces, and everything they can influence by unprincipled effort at defection, will be brought into array to either repudiate the national debt, or to make the assumption of the confederate war debt the condition precedent to its payment. These forces in conjunction will struggle no less for political ascendancy after the war, than they did to overthrow the Union party during the war. It is not to be supposed that these political forces, nurtured in the school of political hypocrisy, will forego any effort to undermine or destroy a power by which they have been temporarily overcome.

Perhaps it is expressing too poor an opinion of human nature to assume that there are *high influences* in the present Union party that might prove susceptible if the temptation was made strong enough. At the commencement of the war the confederates boasted that “a hundred millions of dollars would suborn what of the Northern and European press might be needed for the purpose.” A thousand millions of confederate bonds, divided amongst members of Congress and their coadjutors, would be tempting to men of easy political morality, and it is much to be feared that the class of men who weigh their integrity in the scale of mercenary interest might prove vulnerable. 14 The condition of our country, its population and its existing antagonisms, are peculiar, and have no precedent. To maintain the government, its credit and faith, we shall need the assistance of numbers, and the continued majority of numbers, and we need have no scruple in making the declaration that we shall need every man, North and South, whatever his color, that can be influenced to stand by the government in consideration of the protection it gives. If men do not believe this, let Congress propose a constitutional amendment, *interdicting the repudiation of the Union war debt, the assumption of the confederate war debt, and forbidding compensation for emancipated negroes, and see whether the rebel influences and their political adjuncts will ratify it*. Extraordinary combinations of defection require extraordinary precautions, and if we have not learned enough to be vigilant in guarding the future, then, indeed, have the teachings of calamity been entirely lost. It will be a deplorable subject for contemplation should the precedent, under existing circumstances, be established, of nurturing political infidelity by allowing it a gratuitous advantage over fidelity, thus attempting to conciliate treason by disparaging loyalty. Perhaps some philosopher of the De Bow school may be found who can show that this can be done with safety.

DESIRABLE AND PROBABLE FINALITY.

In our political family, like all others, we shall have wealth and poverty—intelligence and ignorance—success in life and misfortune in life—some going up on the wheel of fortune and some going down—some at the top and some at the bottom; but, according to our *political scripture*, all endowed with the same natural and inalienable rights. Of all the ingredients, wealth has most influence and most power for good or evil. Intelligence has great power for good or evil, according to the frame

of mind of its possessor. Let their influence in combination for once be rightly directed and cast on the side of natural right. Let political and Christian morality go along with them, and under their joint influence we shall hear no more objections urged against colored suffrage. We would suggest, as the platform, the following resolution of the Democratic League:

"It is further *declared and resolved*, That the education of the masses is the best investment that property ever made; that the elevation of the masses is the best guaranty that property ever secured; whilst the distribution of power through the enfranchisement of the masses is the only foundation of stable government, that has both the disposition and wisdom to give protection and maintain the natural rights of man against the usurpations of class and power; that in just such proportion as the respective states of this Union have proceeded upon these principles in combination, and made advancement on this platform, have they secured protection to person and property, manifested adherence to the government of their fathers, and resisted attempts to overthrow it."

Let us now remember that, like Sinbad, we have thrown "the old man of the sea" off our shoulders. That great disturber of our political peace, slavery, is dead. This, as all know, was the main cause of dissension between the Northern political forces. It was the cause of contention between the Union and the South. Remember, also, that the North and South will hereafter stand upon the same political, educational, and industrial platform, and the same incentives to general progress. Remember, also, that the great bulk of our population is a native-born, educated, politically-skilled population, and intensely attached to its country and free government. There will be no want of popular power to hold the course of the most encouraging policy entirely steady.

The result of the war has altered the South to the extent of a radical change. The political South can no longer be made a pro-slavery South. The industrial South will have become a free-labor South. The educational condition will be no longer confined to the wealthy few. The principle of civil liberty, struck down by pro-slavery ruffianism, will now be revived and maintained. The press, heretofore, subservient to a class only, will be privileged to advocate common right. The pulpit will no longer proclaim the newly-created "divinity" which had been set up on the platform of kidnapping. The South proper is now virtually composed of twelve millions of free labor, and well will it be, if the Southern political mind can now bring itself to adopt its best course. The spirit which sought to establish an aristocracy is hopelessly broken, and no change of condition, now contemplated, will ever be able to revive it. Those who have erred and miscalculated so grievously, will have neither home nor country that they ever can contemplate with satisfaction, unless they can create for themselves anew that frame of mind which comports with the necessities of the future. That this will be done to a very great extent there is little doubt.

People in all parts of the Union can now contemplate a future nationality, greater than has ever existed before, and more powerful than can be anticipated on any other part of the globe. They can contemplate that nationality in connection with a country unequalled in the extent and variety of whatever contributes to the sustenance of population. The very prestige of power may be made to keep the peace with the rest of the world, provided that prestige is secured by a cordial union. No such union can ever be possible, except upon one basis—EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW. To this principle we must come, and it will be the duty alike of all to cast their political, moral, and Christian influence in favor of the broad and comprehensive platform of equal rights. On this we can harmonize more effectually than on any other basis, and it becomes the duty of all to assist. Pertinacity in this direction is now a virtue, and no class of our countrymen should be remiss in well-doing, remembering always, that each individual is a part, or should be made a part of the government.

If the South cheerfully acquiesces in this programme, and cordially acts up to it, the South will have made more material progress in the next ten years than it would have made under the old *régime* in thirty. Christian civilization will be advanced in proportionate degree. It will react upon the North, and nearly the whole ground of difference heretofore existing among the Northern political forces will be done away. We may now conclude with moral certainty, that the good sense of the nation will seek to make BYGONES a subject, if we may use the term, of mournful satisfaction. We shall be enabled to see in our past troubles a Providence that has brought us through seeming calamity to a better and brighter destiny. "Liberty to all"—"Rights to all"—"Justice to all!" This has been the vantage ground upon which the Union has fought the battle, and this great platform will yet be contemplated in the South as the source of highest satisfaction. The world is beginning to comprehend that the Union arms have fought the battle of the South, and that all the Union victories, under the dispensation of a wise Providence, have been victories also in favor of the South. Let this be the sentiment, and this the consolation, and all will be well.